



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the transportation of passengers within the state. After the rate had been tested by operating under it for two years, it was shown to yield a return only slightly, if at all, in excess of the actual out-of-pocket expense of conducting the service plus the apportioned share of fixed charges attributable to the passenger traffic. *Held*, that the statute is unconstitutional. *Norfolk & Western Ry. Co. v. Conley*, U. S. Sup. Ct. Off. No. 197 (March 8, 1915).

For a discussion of the principles involved in these cases see this issue of the REVIEW, p. 683.

RESTRAINT OF TRADE — SHERMAN ANTI-TRUST LAW — SIZE OF COMBINATION AS A BASIS FOR DISSOLUTION. — The United States brought a bill in equity against the Keystone Watch Case Company charging violations of the first and second sections of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. It appeared that the defendant had acquired control of about fifty per cent of the industry and that it had since imposed restrictive agreements upon jobbers to whom the product was sold. But no inflation of prices, limitation of production, or other abuse of power was shown. *Held*, that the unfair practices be enjoined, but that the petition for dissolution be dismissed. *United States v. Keystone Watch Case Co.*, 218 Fed. 502 (Dist. Ct., E. D., Pa.).

Since the decree by the federal district court in Minnesota dissolving the International Harvester Company, and pending the appeal to the United States Supreme Court, a number of opinions have been given in coördinate courts that display a sharp divergence from the construction laid upon Section 2 of the Sherman Act by that decision. In the principal case three circuit judges adopt the principles to be found in the dissent of Sanborn, J., in the Harvester case, and accept the rule that size alone does not constitute monopoly within the meaning of the Act. See *United States v. International Harvester Co.*, 214 Fed. 987, 1002. There must be unreasonable use of power, and actual or threatened injury to the public to warrant dissolution. See 28 HARV. L. REV. 87. In the "fighting ships" case the court dealt with a combination of steamship lines that was using certain unfair methods, but that decree also stopped short of dissolution and simply enjoined the illegal practices. *United States v. Hamburg American S. S. Line*, 216 Fed. 971. In another steamship case the government established that a large consolidation had taken place, but here too the petition for dissolution was dismissed because no one could be found among shippers, competitors, or the general public who was dissatisfied with it, or who could show unreasonable injury therefrom. *United States v. American-Asiatic S. S. Co.*, 220 Fed. 230. In any case where the record of a combination is likewise barren of grievances on the part of the public or of individuals, to enforce its dissolution solely on account of magnitude is a step thoroughly hostile to the industrial development of the country.

SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE — PARTIAL PERFORMANCE WITH COMPENSATION — CREATION OF DOWER RIGHT IN STRANGER APART FROM SEISIN OF THE HUSBAND. — An owner of land, whose wife had a statutory interest in the property similar to dower, made a contract to convey to the plaintiff in which the wife did not join. The wife later joined with him in a conveyance to the defendant, who had notice of the plaintiff's claim. The plaintiff now brings a bill for specific performance. *Held*, that the defendant convey such interest as the plaintiff could have acquired from the vendor with suitable abatement from the purchase price, or at his own election, convey the whole. *Williams v. Wessels*, 145 Pac. 856 (Kan.).

A release of inchoate dower operates as an extinguishment of the wife's interest. *Withaus v. Schack*, 105 N. Y. 332, 11 N. E. 649; *Chicago Dock Co. v. Kinzie*, 49 Ill. 289. See *Tirrel v. Kenney*, 137 Mass. 30, 32. Consequently it has been held hitherto that a purchaser with notice who gets a conveyance